

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS:

**WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY AND SPECTRUM DEMAND: ADVANCED WIRELESS SERVICES**

Linda K. Moore. Congressional Research Service (CRS). February 24, 2006. 6 pages.

[http://www.ipmall.info/hosted\\_resources/crs/RS20993\\_060320.pdf](http://www.ipmall.info/hosted_resources/crs/RS20993_060320.pdf)

“Advances in wireless telecommunications technology are converging with Internet technology to foster new generations of applications and services. Presently, the United States and other countries are moving to third-generation (3G) and fourth-generation mobile telephony. The defining feature of these technologies is that transmission speeds are significantly faster than prevailing technology, making it possible to provide services such as high speed access to the Internet and to receive broadcast television programs. The technologies are seen by some as competing for customers and by others as complementary — providing a broader base and greater choice of devices for wireless communications and networking.”

**THE FEDERAL NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: FUNDING ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES**

Patricia Moloney Figliola. Congressional Research Service (CRS). February 22, 2006. 18 pages.

[http://www.ipmall.info/hosted\\_resources/crs/IB10130\\_060320.pdf](http://www.ipmall.info/hosted_resources/crs/IB10130_060320.pdf)

“The federal government has long played a key role in the country’s information technology (IT) research and development (R&D) activities. The Government’s support of IT R&D began because it had an important interest in creating computers that would be capable of addressing the problems and issues the government needed to solve and study. One of the first such problems was planning the trajectories of artillery and bombs; more recently such problems include simulations of nuclear testing, cryptanalysis, and weather modeling. That interest continues today. That complexity requires there be adequate coordination to ensure the government’s evolving needs (e.g., homeland security) will continue to be met in the most effective manner possible.”

**THE PUSH-PULL EFFECTS OF THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY BOOM AND BUST: INSIGHT FROM MATCHED EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE DATA**

Julie L. Hotchkiss, M. Melinda Pitts and John C. Robertson. Federal Reserve Board of Atlanta. Working Paper 2006-1. February 2006. 28 pages.

<http://www.frbatlanta.org/filelegacydocs/wp0601.pdf>

“This paper examines the inflow and outflow of workers to different industries in Georgia during the information technology (IT) boom of the 1990s and the subsequent bust. Workers in the software and computer services industry were much more likely to have been absent from the Georgia workforce prior to the boom but were no more likely than workers from other industries to have exited the workforce during the bust. Consequently, the Georgia workforce likely experienced a net gain in worker human capital as a result of being an area of concentration of IT-producing activity during the IT boom.”

## CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS:

### USF CONTRIBUTIONS

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. February 28, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1707>

“Universal Service plays a critical role in ensuring that all Americans have access to our nation's communications system, from low income seniors on the Hawaiian Islands to our Eskimo people along the Arctic Ocean. Without Universal Service, just having a dial tone would average about \$200 a month, putting telephone service out of reach of the average family who lives in those areas. The changing face of communications has presented new challenges to this Fund.”

### HEALTH CARE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY: WHAT ARE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR AND BARRIERS TO INTEROPERABLE HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS?

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Science. Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards. February 23, 2006.

<http://www.house.gov/science/hearings/ets06/Feb%2023/index.htm>

“Today we are here to discuss the potential benefits of information technology (IT) to health care providers and consumers, the impact of IT on health care costs and quality, and the major challenges to the widespread use of IT in the health care industry. We will learn about federal, state and private-sector efforts to promote electronic systems that enable health care providers to access patient data from any location.”

### VIDEO FRANCHISING

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. February 15, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1700>

“As different industries begin to emerge into each other’s space, it is the consumer who is poised to win. First it was cable providers offering phone service. Now Americans see wireline phone providers eager to offer video service. As traditional communications providers move into new services bringing choice, innovation and lower prices to consumers, Congress is confronted with reexamining our legacy regulations.”

### STATE AND LOCAL ISSUES AND MUNICIPAL NETWORKS

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. February 14, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1706>

“Concerned that broadband is not happening quickly enough some municipalities want to build and operate their own broadband networks while others want to sponsor them. Some commercial providers have cried foul and are concerned that they cannot compete fairly against municipalities. And there are states that have prohibited municipalities from offering telecommunications service and are pondering prohibiting broadband service. We will hear today from all of you in order to help determine whether municipalities might play a role, how it would interact with Universal Service Fund, and what impact it has on the commercial sector.”

### PROTECTING CONSUMERS’ PHONE RECORDS

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Product Safety, and Insurance. February 8, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1742>

“This hearing will examine ways to protect consumers’ phone records from being fraudulently obtained and sold into the public domain. In recent months, a number of websites have popped up selling consumer phone records for as little as \$100-dollars. Experts say that the records are usually obtained by “data brokers” who pose as customers requesting their records or computer hackers who surreptitiously retrieve the data online. This fraud can be as harmful and disconcerting as when a third-party uses false pretenses to obtain an innocent person’s confidential financial records.”

#### NET NEUTRALITY

U.S. Senate. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Full Committee. February 7, 2006.

<http://commerce.senate.gov/hearings/witnesslist.cfm?id=1705>

“This hearing on Internet Neutrality is one of the most difficult but most important issues before this Committee as we consider revisions to the nation’s communications laws. How we decide the issue will determine whether cable companies and the telephone companies can generate the revenue needed to justify billions of dollars in investment to deploy fiber and upgrade existing broadband networks. It will also determine whether the Internet remains a free marketplace of ideas with no gatekeeper and free of interference or private regulation.”

#### PHONE RECORDS FOR SALE: WHY AREN'T PHONE RECORDS SAFE FROM PRETEXTING?

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Energy and Commerce. Full Committee. February 1, 2006.

<http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/Hearings/02012006hearing1763/hearing.htm>

“The issue of third parties known as “data brokers” obtaining and selling consumers’ telephone call records, which has been widely reported, is a tremendous concern for consumers, lawmakers, and regulators alike. Numerous websites advertise the sale of personal telephone records for a price. Specifically, data brokers advertise the availability of cell phone records, which include calls to and/or from a particular cell phone number, the duration of such calls, and may even include the physical location of the cell phone. In addition to selling cell phone call records, many data brokers also claim to provide calling records for landline and voice over Internet protocol, as well as non-published phone numbers.”

#### RESEARCH CENTER REPORTS:

##### RURAL BROADBAND INTERNET USE

Data Memo. The Pew Internet & American Life Project. February 26, 2006. 10 pages.

[http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP\\_Rural\\_Broadband.pdf](http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Rural_Broadband.pdf)

“By the end of 2005, 24% of rural Americans had high-speed Internet connections at home compared with 39% of adult Americans living elsewhere. In 2003, 9% of rural Americans had broadband at home, less than half the rate (22%) in urban and suburban American. For overall Internet use – by whatever connection from any location – the penetration rate for adult rural Americans lagged the rest of the country by 8 percentage points at the end of 2005 (a 62% to 70% margin). This is about half the gap that existed at the end of 2003.”

##### BROWSING THE WEB FOR FUN

Data Memo. The Pew Internet & American Life Project. February 15, 2006. 6 pages.

[http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP\\_Surfforfun\\_Feb06.pdf](http://www.pewInternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Surfforfun_Feb06.pdf)

“Nearly a third of Internet users go online on a typical day for no particular reason, just for fun or to pass the time. Two-thirds of all Internet users have tried surfing the Web just to pass the time, according to a survey we conducted in December 2005. Some 40 million people said they were surfing for fun on a typical day during the month. This number is up from 25 million people who were browsing for no particular reason in November 2004, the most recent time when this question was asked by the Pew Internet Project.”

#### THINK TANK OPINION AND ANALYSIS:

##### WE'RE ALL FOR COMPETITION, BUT...

John W. Mayo. AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies. Policy Matters 06-03. February 2006.

<http://www.aei.brookings.org/policy/page.php?id=244>

“The opportunities facing modern telephone companies to extend their networks to provide video and ultra-high speed broadband Internet access threaten the market power enjoyed by traditional cable monopolies. To forestall the threat, the cable industry has solicited, with some success, the 33,000 local franchising authorities around the country to delay the ability of modern telephone companies to enter its traditionally monopolistic turf. Their argument in a nutshell: “we’re all for competition, but...””

##### TOWARD AN EVOLUTIONARY REGIME FOR SPECTRUM GOVERNANCE: LICENSING OR UNRESTRICTED POLICY?

William J. Baumol and Dorothy Robyn. AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies. Books and Monographs 06-01. February 2006. 96 pages.

<http://www.aei.brookings.org/admin/authorpdfs/page.php?id=1246>

“The authors evaluate two options for spectrum governance: a market approach that treats licensed access to the spectrum as private property and a commons (or unlicensed) approach. They conclude that while neither is perfect, a commons regime would have severe shortcomings, including the creation of powerful vested interests. They embrace a modified market regime, in which the government could change the rules if necessary to accommodate currently unforeseeable changes in technology and other circumstances.”

##### ARTISTS AND CULTURE: EMPOWERING THE FORMER TO FOSTER THE LATTER

Patrick Ross. The Progress & Freedom Foundation. Progress on Point 13.6. February 2006. 9 pages.

<http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/pops/pop13.6artistculture.pdf>

“An irony of the ongoing debate over intellectual property rights in the digital age is that the most critical party to the debate -- the artist -- is often an afterthought in the dialogue. All parties in the debate are quick to insist that the artist is paramount, for without that creative genius there would be no content over which to debate. All parties are also quick to insist that the best interest of artists is at the heart of their arguments and resides at the forefront of their fight. Yet we must accept the truism that in any debate, participants are motivated by self-interest. The best interests of artists can only be promoted by their distributors or their end-users, when such interests coincide. Those interests do not always coincide, and artists often find their voices drowned out by the back-and-forth between their distributors and those that claim to be defending "culture.””

GPLV3 AND WEB BUSINESSES: IS THE FREE SOFTWARE FOUNDATION GETTING TRICKY?  
Tony Healy. The Progress & Freedom Foundation. Progress Snapshot Release 2.6. February 2006. 5 pages.

<http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/ps/2006/ps2.6healy.pdf>

“The recently-proposed “Version 3” of the General Public License (GPLv3) could dramatically change the business environment for Google, Amazon, and other prominent web businesses that use servers running the Linux operating system, by forcing them to make their technology available to competitors. The change is controversial and, perhaps for that reason, subject to uncertainty. In this brief I explain how the change would work and why the evidence seems to confirm that GPLv3 does indeed carry this meaning.”

#### DEFUSING DRM

Doug Lichtman. The Progress & Freedom Foundation. Academic Advisory Council Bulletin 1.1. February 2006. 10 pages.

<http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/ip/bulletins/bulletin1.1DRM.pdf>

“Ten years ago, a meaningful discussion of copyright law could focus almost exclusively on the federal copyright statute and related case law. Today, by contrast, technology takes center stage. For instance, in the iTunes music store, it is not copyright law, but encryption algorithms that restrict consumers from playing purchased tunes on portable devices other than the officially-sanctioned iPod. Likewise, on music CDs distributed by Sony BMG, it is not the threat of litigation, but computer software that discourages purchasers from copying tracks for friends or personal use. These are just two among many examples of what has come to be known as “digital rights management” (DRM) technology. And, with DRM now increasingly mainstream, it is finally time to ask publicly a question that academics, technologists, and some policy-makers have been quietly discussing for some time: How should copyright law respond?”

#### MANAGING INFORMATION AND ITS SECURITY: THE ROLE OF POLICYMAKERS, THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND CONSUMERS

Orson Swindle and Patrick Ross. The Progress & Freedom Foundation. Progress on Point Release 13.2. February 2006. 9 pages.

<http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/pops/pop13.2internetsecurity.pdf>

“The free flow of information is critical to the functioning of the modern economy. The remarkable benefits derived from information technology and use unfortunately are accompanied by significant vulnerabilities. One need but look at the multitudes of information security breaches and the harm done in 2005 to appreciate the nature of the problem. While the harm done is not nearly as dramatic as portrayed in the media, it is significant in terms of actual consumer harm and, perhaps even more so, in driving perceptions of consumers who fear that they are not safe nor in control.”